



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/335,648	06/18/1999	KEVIN L. KIMLE	P03566USO	6709

7590 10/21/2004

DANIEL J COSGROVE  
ZARLEY MCKEE THOMTE VOORHEES & SEASE  
SUITE 3200  
801 GRAND AVENUE  
DES MOINES, IA 503092721

EXAMINER

KYLE, CHARLES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/335,648

Applicant(s)

KIMLE ET AL.

Examiner

Charles R Kyle

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date September 7, 2004.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed September 7, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

#### ***First Paragraph***

**Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Claim recites that multiple stages of approval by both parties after the input is validated by the system and is executable using digital signatures. A review of the originally filed Specification makes no mention of this limitation.

#### ***Second Paragraph***

The rejections of Claims 21 and 22 of the prior office action are withdrawn based on Applicants' amendments.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3624

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 1-37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**As to Claims 1-12 and 30-37**, the relationships among, buyer, user, supplier and producers are unclear. It is unclear if a user is a supplier, buyer or both. An antecedent basis problem based on the phrase “that producer” is confusing and makes the producer’s relation to other parties unclear.

Step ( c ) recites establishing a defined allocation of an amount to a user (assumed to be a supplier), but no method describing such allocation is set forth. For purposes of examination, the Examiner understands that an allocation of one hundred percent of available commodity constitutes an allocation. Additionally, allocation of an amount of a commodity available to a user (supplier) appears to supplies commodity *to* a supplier; the Examiner’s best understanding of the invention is that the supplier is allocated opportunity to fulfill a portion of a buyer’s desired order. This is not claimed.

Step (e) recites the selection of a specific contract program; this selection step has no apparent relation to the remainder of the method steps as the “specific contract program” selected is not referred to later in the Claim.

The use of the adjective “pending” to describe a contract is confusing; a contract is either executed or not and cannot be partially executed. Perhaps Applicants intend that a proposed contract document is prepared for review of the parties.

Art Unit: 3624

The use of the words "qualify" and "qualifies" in steps (h) and (i) is confusing. It appears that Applicants intend that a contract is prepared if the specifics of type, amount and allocation proposed by buyer and supplier match, rather than "qualifying."

**Claims 1-12 and 30-37** recite the limitation "that producer" instep (h) There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

**As to Claims 13-23**, step (b) recites establishing a desired allocation of an amount to a user (assumed to be a supplier), but no method describing such allocation is set forth. For purposes of examination, the Examiner understands that an allocation of one hundred percent of available commodity constitutes an allocation. Additionally, allocation of an amount of a commodity available to a user (supplier) appears to supplies commodity *to* a supplier; the Examiner's best understanding of the invention is that the supplier is allocated opportunity to fulfill a portion of a buyer's desired order. This is not claimed.

The use of the adjective "pending" to describe a contract is confusing; a contract is either executed or not and cannot be partially executed. Perhaps Applicants intend that a proposed contract document is prepared for review of the parties.

The use of the words "qualify" and "qualifies" in steps (1) and (2) is confusing. It appears that Applicants intend that a contract is prepared if the specifics of type, amount and allocation proposed by buyer and supplier match, rather than "qualifying."

**As to Claim 25**, step (b) recites establishing a desired allocation of an amount to a user (assumed to be a supplier), but no method describing such allocation is set forth. For purposes of examination, the Examiner understands that an allocation of one hundred percent of available commodity constitutes an allocation. Additionally, allocation of an amount of a commodity

Art Unit: 3624

available to a user (supplier) appears to supplies commodity *to* a supplier; the Examiner's best understanding of the invention is that the supplier is allocated opportunity to fulfill a portion of a buyer's desired order. This is not claimed.

The use of the adjective "pending" to describe a contract is confusing; a contract is either executed or not and cannot be partially executed. Perhaps Applicants intend that a proposed contract document is prepared for review of the parties.

The use of the words "qualify" and "qualifies" in steps (i) and (j) is confusing. It appears that Applicants intend that a contract is prepared if the specifics of type, amount and allocation proposed by buyer and supplier match, rather than "qualifying."

**With respect to Claims 26-28**, see the discussion of Claim 25 above.

The Claims have been examined to the best of the Examiner's ability given the condition of the Claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

For clarity, the rejections set forth in the prior office action are restated below.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-2, 4-8 and 10-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,794,207 Walker et al in view of US 5,924,082 Silverman et al.

Art Unit: 3624

**Concerning Claim 1**, Walker et al disclose the invention substantially as claimed including a method of facilitating the contracting of agricultural commodities using the Internet (Abstract) comprising the steps of:

providing a Web server connected to the Internet (Col. 12, lines 8-21);

providing in operative communication with the server a centralized database system for the storage and retrieval of data (Fig. 2, elements 255, 269, 265, 267 and Col. 12, line 35 to Col. 13, line 62);

storing data in the database system relating to types and amounts of potential commodities desired by one or more commodity buyers (Col. 13, lines 1-10 and 23-29) and establishing a defined allocation of a type of commodity available to a user of the system according to at least one allocation parameter (in the case of Walker, the allocation is defined to be 100% allocated to a successful supplier; Applicants' claim language recites no limitation to distinguish over this case);

in response to a command input into the system, displaying a listing of desired commodities including information related to the types, amounts available of the commodities (Figure 9 and Col. 18, line 56 to Col. 19, line 12);

after being provided the ability to review listings on the system (Col. 9, lines 10-30) receiving input data from a potential supplier of an commodity relating to a specific type and amount of a commodity which the supplier is willing to supply to the buyer harvest or at other times (Col. 13, lines 11-22 and 30-34); and

generating a contract for the sale of the specific type and amount of the commodity by the supplier to the buyer (Fig. 2, element 280 and Col. 13, lines 44-48).

Walker further discloses that a contract may be pending as well as binding at Col. 9, lines 45-51 and Col. 22, line 39 to Col. 23, line 18. Here a CPO is set out by a buyer, but does not bind a supplier; the supplier can respond with a counteroffer. Walker discloses comparison of parameters of a buyer offer to a supplier's needs by the supplier but does not specifically disclose the comparison is based on the specific parameters of offer and bid. Silverman discloses this limitation at Col. 7, line 13 to Col. 8, line 8 and discloses generation of a pending contract reviewed by buyer and supplier at Col. 8, lines 50-63. Silverman further discloses decrementing a current amount available when a contract issues at Col. 7, lines 55-63. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to allow a trader to resubmit non-complying bids so as to remain competitive in trading. Also see Silverman at Col. 8, lines 3-5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Walker with the described features of Silverman and known trading features because this would provide a detailed implementation of the negotiation/counteroffer method disclosed by Walker.

Walker does not disclose storage, display or receipt of input data specifically relating to types, deliveries and amounts of desired or offered agricultural commodities.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The recited providing, storing, displaying, data receipt and generating steps would be performed the same regardless of the data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).



Art Unit: 3624

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the recited method steps for any type of data, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the invention.

**As to Claim 2**, Walker et al disclose information input by a browser at Col. 15, line 66 to Col. 16, line 2.

**Regarding Claims 4-9**, they also recite performing the recited method steps on more detailed forms of agricultural products. As with Claim 1, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

**Concerning Claim 10**, see the discussions above. Walker discloses updating the listing of commodities at Col. 18, lines 44-55. Walker does not specifically disclose that updating is done as a result of contracting. Official Notice is taken that such updating based on a completed contract is old and well known. For example, when a customer completes a sales contract but must take later delivery, the goods he/she purchased are removed from inventory so as to assure the goods are available to the customer and not "double sold." It would have been obvious to have updated the listing based on a change in data as a result of contracting because this would have assured that commodities contracted for are available for delivery.

**Regarding Claim 11**, Walker et al disclose a paper contract at Col. 6, lines 35-44.

**As to Claim 12**, Walker et al disclose an electronic contract using a digital signature at Col. 6, lines 45-65.

**Regarding Claim 13**, see the discussion of Claim 1 above. As to the element recited in Claim 13 of updating data, see the discussion of Claim 10.

**As to Claim 14**, Walker discloses management of delivery terms and times at Col. 20, lines 30-48. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to have buyer determined delivery terms and methods included in a contract. For example, the buyer must determine such terms to assure that someone is present to take delivery; including such terms in a contract provides enforceability for the delivery terms. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to provide buyer determined delivery in a contract to assure that delivery was made per buyer requirements.

**Regarding Claim 15**, it also recites performing the recited method steps on more detailed forms of agricultural products. As with Claim 1, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability.

**Concerning Claim 16**, Walker discloses pricing of a contract based on a variable at Col. 10, lines 40-46. Official Notice is taken that pricing is usually the most material term of a contract. Price is the *sine qua non* of commerce.

**As to Claim 17**, Walker does not specifically disclose pricing based on delivery time or quality. Official Notice is taken that basing pricing a contract on quality is old and well known in the art. For example, contract pricing of electronic bandwidth is based on quality of service.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walker to use quality as a factor in pricing because this would have assured buyers that they would receive value for money spent.

**Regarding Claim 18**, Walker et al teach accessing a centralized database installed on an Internet Web server at Col. 5, line 66 to Col. 16, line 22.

**As to Claim 20**, see the discussion of Claims 13 and 4 above.

**Concerning Claims 21-23**, see the discussions above. Walker further discloses allocation of data based on a variable at Fig. 2, elements contained in element 250.

Walker does not specifically allocation based on agricultural contract variables such as allocation by elevators or by geographic region..

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The recited allocating step would be performed the same regardless of the data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the recited method steps for any type of data, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the invention.

**As to Claim 25**, Walker et al disclose an apparatus for contracting for commodities over a wide area network comprising an application/web server and a database serve at Col. 11, lines 58-63 and Col. 14, lines 30-52; communications links for the above at Fig. 1, elements 100, 110, 120; one or more user terminals, Fig. 1, elements 300, 400; and software to store data in the database data relating to buyers' desires for commodities (Col. 13, lines 1-10 and 23-29); in response to a command input, displaying a list of desired commodities and related information regarding types, amounts or deliveries of the desired commodities (Figure 9 and Col. 18, line 56 to Col. 19, line 12; receiving input data relating to a specific type and amount of commodity which the supplier is willing to supply (Col. 13, lines 11-22 and 30-34) and generating a contract

Art Unit: 3624

for the sale of the specific type and amount of the commodity by the supplier to the buyer (Fig. 2, element 280 and Col. 13, lines 44-48). Further, see the discussion of Claim 1.

Walker does not disclose storage, display or receipt of input data specifically relating to types, deliveries and amounts of desired or offered agricultural commodities.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The recited providing, storing, displaying, data receipt and generating steps would be performed the same regardless of the data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the recited method steps for any type of data, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the invention.

**As to Claim 26**, Walker et al disclose a wide area distributed network (WAN) at Col. 11, lines 58-63; plural seller computers in operative communication with the WAN at Fig. 1, elements 300, Fig. 3 and Col. 14, lines 53 to Col. 15, line 22; plural buyer computers in operative communication with the WAN at Fig. 1, elements 400, Fig. 4 and Col. 15, lines 22 to 29; a database storing data relating to a specific type and amount of commodity which a supplier is willing to supply (Col. 13, lines 11-22 and 30-34); a database storing data relating to buyers' desires for commodities (Col. 13, lines 1-10 and 23-29); and generation of a contract for the sale

Art Unit: 3624

of the specific type and amount of the commodity by the supplier to the buyer (Fig. 2, element 280 and Col. 13, lines 44-48). Further, see the discussion of Claim 1.

Walker does not disclose storage, display or receipt of input data specifically relating to types, deliveries and amounts of desired or offered agricultural commodities.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The recited providing, storing, displaying, data receipt and generating steps would be performed the same regardless of the data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the recited method steps for any type of data, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the invention.

**Concerning Claim 27**, Walker et al disclose a software security component to restrict access to the system at Col. 12, lines 27-30 and Col. 15, lines 3-5.

**Regarding Claim 28**, Walker et al disclose varying levels of access to data by authorized users of the system at Col. 27, line 19 to Col. 30, line 29.

**With respect to Claim 29**, Walker discloses conversion of a pending contract to a binding contract at Col. 9, lines 45-51.

**With respect to Claim 30**, Walker does not specifically disclose that a contract term, allocation can be changed. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to adjust such

Art Unit: 3624

terms as the buyer/ seller relationship changed. For example, it would be sensible to change such an allocation if a supplier was experienced a loss in productive capacity. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to adjust contract terms such as allocation because this would allow contracts to most accurately reflect market conditions.

**Concerning Claim 31**, it recites steps whereby partially correct information is prevented from updating browser state. Such a procedure would have been obvious to prevent partially correct data from being used to update browser state when the user did not complete a task. For example, if a user entered only part of new contract data, modification of old data with partial new data would produce incorrect data storage. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to prevent such incorrect data entry to preserve data integrity.

**As to Claim 32**, see the discussion of Claim 1 and it would further be obvious to require modification of an allocation parameter and quantity to make a newly proposed contract compliant with buyers' needs.

**With respect to Claim 33**, see the discussion of Claim 1.

**As to Claim 34**, see the discussion of Claim 27 above.

**As to claim 35**, it was old and well known to provide varying access levels to users. For example some users would need access to application data while other users would need administrator level access to perform system maintenance. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Walker to provide varying access levels because this would reduce system exposure to appropriate user levels.

Art Unit: 3624

**With respect to Claim 36**, Walker discloses plural buyers and sellers at Summary of the Invention.

**Concerning Claim 37**, see the discussion of Claim 30 and messaging would be inherent to communicating allocation data.

**Claims 3 and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al in view of Silverman and further in view of the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, Third Edition, hereinafter referred to as Dictionary.

**As to Claims 3 and 19**, Walker et al discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussions of Claims 1, 13 and 18 above. It does not specifically disclose the use of Java or other applets for input of and access to information to the system. Dictionary, however teaches the Java language and Java applets as useful for secure, robust, platform neutral programming of interactive applications for Internet Web browsers. See Java and Java applet topics, page 268 of Dictionary. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used Java applets for data input and access as taught by Dictionary, in combination with Walker et al because this would have provided a for secure, robust, platform neutral method for users to input and access information to contract for commodities on the Internet.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles R Kyle whose telephone number is (703) 305-4458. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00-2:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (703) 308-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687.



Art Unit: 3624

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Examiner Charles Kyle

Handwritten signature of Charles Kyle in cursive script.

crk

October 15, 2004

Handwritten signature of Vincent Millin in cursive script.

VINCENT MILLIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600